

Attorney Docket No.: UTL 00004

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claims 1-25 were pending. Claims 12, 13, 24 and 25 are allowed. Claims 1 and 14-23 were rejected. Claims 2-11 were objected to as allowable if rewritten in independent from including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-11 and for allowance of claims 12-13 and 24-25.

Applicant has amended claims 2-11. Applicant has cancelled claims 1 and 14-23. Accordingly, claims 12-13 and 24-25 remain in the present application.

In section 1 of the Office Action, the examiner stated that Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 15 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Das (5,496,795). Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 15 and 20 are allowable over Das. However, to expedite prosecution, applicant has cancelled claims 1, 15 and 20, without prejudice to further prosecution. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of claims 1, 15 and 20 in a subsequent patent application.

In section 5 of the Office Action, claims 14, 16-19 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Das in view of Romanofsky (6,292,143). Applicant respectfully asserts that claims claims 14, 16-19 and 21-23 are allowable over Das in view of Romanofsky. However, to expedite prosecution, applicant has cancelled claims claims 14, 16-19 and 21-23, without prejudice to further prosecution. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of claims claims 14, 16-19 and 21-23 in a subsequent patent application.

Attorney Docket No.: UTL 00004

In section 6 of the Office Action, claims 12-13 and 24-25 are allowed. Applicant thanks the examiner for allowing claims 12-13 and 24-25.

In section 7 of the Office Action, claims 2-11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The examiner indicated that claims 2-11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-11. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Claims 3-11 have been amended to depend from amended independent claim 2. Accordingly, claims 2-11 should now be allowable.

Attorney Docket No.: UTL 00004


**CONCLUSION**

For all the foregoing reasons, a notice of allowance of directed to claims 2-13 and 24-25 is respectfully requested. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

8/23/04

  
Jonathan T. Velasco, Esq.  
Reg. No.: 42,200

Jonathan T. Velasco, Esq.  
KYOCERA WIRELESS CORP.  
P.O. Box 928289  
San Diego, CA 92192-8289  
Direct Dial: (858) 882-3501  
Direct Fax: (858) 882-2485